Point of order *re*: giving Priority to the consideration of no confidence motion

†Sri V. S. PATIL.—On a Point of Order, Sir. We have given this motion of 'No-confidence' and according to those rules, and especially Rule 53 says;

> "No motion which seeks to raise discussion on a matter pending before any statutory tribunal or statutory authority performing any judicial or quasi-judicial functions or any commission or court of enquiry appointed to enquire into or investigate any matter shall ordinarily be permitted to be moved."

This motion, we have given yesterday. If the Speaker is of opinion that the motion is in order, he shall read out to the motion to the Assembly and shall request the Member to move. So, I submit that the motion is a short one sentence motion. There is no ambiguity and anything of the sort. So, that motion must have precedence over all other work of the House and when that motion has been given sufficiently long before the prescribed time limit.

Mr. SPEAKER.—When was it given?

Sri V. S PATIL.—It was given yesterday.

Mr. SPEAKER.—at what time?

Sri V. S. PATIL —At 3-30 P.M. To be specific, it may be between 3-30 and 3-35P.M. So, there was a sufficient time for your office to go through that resolution and allow one of us to move this motion on the Floor of this House. Unless that is done, no other business, except questions and answers can be transacted on the floor of this House. Therefore, the business that is being carried on now is contrary to the provisions of the particular rule and that is why that shoul not be transacted. Whether the moving of the other legislation or Bills is in order, that is my Point of Order.

2-P.M.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Sir, this motion that has been made is not an ordinary one.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Which are the rules on which the member is relying?

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—I rely on Rule 153. The nature of the motion itself is unusual. In the sense that it does not come up frequently. Now it is the accepted practice that when a motion of want of confidence in the Minister is given notice of, then in my humble opinion, the Speaker will have to bring it to the notice of the House and ascertain if the House is willing to give its leave for the discussion of the no-confidence motion. The rules have been very specific. A particular rule goes to provide that the Speaker has very little discretion in the sense that he will have to fix up a date within three days. That goes to show the preference that this motion is entitled to get. My friend

Sri V. S. Patil has relevantly pointed out that this rule 153 is in a way mandatory. We have given notice of this motion yesterday by 3-35 P.M. and the Secretariat has had enough time to ponder over this motion. So Sir, any business that is going to be transacted in violation of Rule 153 would not be proper and so I request the Speaker that the motion may be taken up and then disposed off.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ನಾವು ಮೊದಲೇ ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದ ಹಾಗೆ 153ನೇ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ಬಹಳ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿ ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದು ವಿಶೇಷವಾದ ಸೂಚನೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಹತ್ವವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೊಬ್ಬರು ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸವೇ ಸಂಜೆ ಸೂಚನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಸಮಯವಿತ್ತು. ಇವತ್ತು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರಗಳ ಕಾಲವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ನಾವು ಕೇಳಿದೆವು: ಇಂಥ ಸೂಚನೆ ಇದೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು. ನಂತರದಲ್ಲೂ ಕೇಳಿದೆವು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ನಮಗೆ ಏನು ಕಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತದೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥ ಮಾಡದೆ ಬೇರೆ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದು ತಪ್ಪಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಕ್ರಮಬದ್ಧವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯ. ಹಾಗೆ ತಮಗೆ ಸಮಯ ಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ, ಈ ವಿಧಿ ಬಂದುವಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಇವತ್ತು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನನಗನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥ ಇಕ್ಕಟ್ಟಾದ್ದೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರೊ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What does the member imply by that?

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಹಾಗಲ್ಲ, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ. ನಿಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಕಳಿಸಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಾಗ ಅವರು ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ಬಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಅವರು ಸರಿಯೇ ಇವರು ಸರಿಯೇ ಎಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದೇಶನವನ್ನು ತಾವು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಅಲೋ ಮಾಡಿ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು, ಓಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಕುವುದು ಅವರ ಕಡೆ ಆಯಿತು ಅಥವಾ ಇವರ ಕಡೆ ಆಯಿತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು; ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ನುತ್ತೊಂದು ಮಗದೊಂದು ತರುವುದರಿಂದ, ತಾವೇ ಅನೇಕ ಸಾರಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವಂತೆ ವೇಳೆ ಕಳೆದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನನಗನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅವರಿಗೆ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಲಿಲ್ಲವಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ತಾವು ಒಂದು ಜಡ್ಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡಿ. The motion is not in order ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಅಥವಾ the motion in order ಎಂದು just put it to the House. That is my request. ನನ್ನ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಅಷ್ಟೆ. ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ದಿನ ಎಳೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾದುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ದಿನ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ. At the appointed hour ನೀವು ಓಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನೀವೆ ಇಲ್ಲರುತ್ತೀರಿ, ಏನೂ ಅನಾಹುತವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಹೋಗುವುದು, ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗುವುದು, ನಾವು ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಎತ್ತುವುದು ಸಭೆಯ ವೇಳೆ ವ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ರೂಲ್ 153 ಬಹಳ ಸರಳವಾಗಿದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿದೆ. ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತಿರುಳಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಾರದು. ಇದನ್ನು ತಾವು ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಾಲ ಏಕೆ ಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಕೂಡಲೆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು, ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟು ಅದರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನರಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನರಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಸಭೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್‌ನ್ನು ತಾವು ಎತ್ತಿ ಹಿಡಿದು ನನಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರೆಂದು ನಾನು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

†Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Sir, clause 153 (2) is clear that the Speaker has no power to hold over the motion that has been sent. If the motion that is given notice of is in the opinion of the Hon'ble Speaker not in order, that can be held over. If it is in order, then he shall read the

(SRI K. LAKKAPPA)

motion to the Assembly. Rules have not been framed to hold over the question by the Speaker. Therefore, the Hon'ble Speaker has got absolute power to deal with the matter today and so far as this motion is concerned, there is no specific rule which has been framed to hold over the matter.

ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋಪಾಲ ಸಾಲೆನ್ನ (ಮೂಡಬಿದರೆ).—ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಂಥ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಯದೆ ನಮಗೆ ಹೊರಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ. ನನಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರವಲ್ಲ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲರುವವರಿಗೆಲ್ಲ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ. ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರಗಳ ಕಾಲವಾದ ಕೂಡಲೇ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ನಾವು ಮತ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆ ಸಹ ಹೋಗುವಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. I am very serious. We cannot go out until this question is decided. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಬೇಗನೆ ಮುಗಿಸಿಬಿಡುವುದು ಉತ್ತಮ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

MR. SPEAKER.—Is there any Hon'ble Member desiring to speak on the Point of Order because I do not want that anybody should feel that he is not given an opportunity, though it is not good that so many Hon'ble Members should speak on the point of order?

Now Sri V. S. Patil will kindly tell me:

Was the point taken up a little earlier? Was this matter raised by Sri Sivappa twice and I dealt with it and I said something which is on record and then business began to be transacted? Can the Hon'ble Member raise point of order afterthat?

SRI V. S. PATIL.—Sir, this motion ought to have been moved at the beginning of the day because there was no question hour. But my friend the Leader of the Opposition tried and I do not know Sir, or it has not been made plain to the House as to what took place between the Hon'ble Speaker and the Leader of the Opposition regarding this in your Chamber or here across the table. We were waiting to see that permission would be given to us to raise this question on the floor of the House. We were waiting and waiting till something was going and completely we were not attending to the other business that was going on. We were simply waiting for you to catch our eyes and ask us to stand up and move the motion.

MR. SPEAKER.—I have to catch the Hon'ble Members' eyes!

SRI V. S. PATIL.—But unfortunately till now, nearly about 1½ hours, we are not at all called upon to speak. We are five are six persons who have signed that motion. No one has been called upon to move the motion.

MR. SPEAKER.—Will the Hon. Member kindly agree or disagree that the point of order should be taken at the earliest?

SRI V. S PATIL.—Yes, Sir. We have pointed out that these are the provisions and that this must be given precedence.

That has been brought to your notice.

MR. SPEAKER.—Did it come to an end?

SRI V. S. PATIL.—It had not

MR. SPEAKER.—Then how was the other business taken up?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—We have given the motion. We waited for you to give us permission to stand up and move the motion, but you were engaged in something else. That is why, we raised the point of order and pointed out that there is the motion and under rule 153, we must have precedence. But you did not give us precedence, you proceeded with the other work. That is why, ultimately, as a last resort we have to raise a point of order. We had no desire to raise the point of order; it was just to point out the provision and expect from you that we would be called upon to move the motion. As you were neglecting this side and asking the Government side to have their own business, ultimately we.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Would the Hon'ble Member kindly enlighten me better what he meant by my neglecting 'this side'?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Because you were asking the Government side to proceed with the other business.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is neither fair to you, nor to me nor to the House. I called upon the Minister. He made his speech. There were so many questions, clarifications. 20 minutes work was done. Was not a point of order capable of being raised at that stage?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I expected that we would be called upon to move the motion. We were expecting that but still Minister has been asked to proceed with the Bill. That means our motion for which we have all collected together to-day has been kept in cold storage for to-day. When this has become apparent, I have raised this point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So the Hon'ble Member is of opinion that there is no delay?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—According to the rule, there is a delay.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yet I did not objcet to his raising the point of order. I allowed him and every member to participate in the discussion on the point of order. I did not want to create an impression in the mind of anybody that a point of order had been wrongly shut out.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I submit that the point of order can be raised at any time... ...

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is the point in the Hon'ble Member's saying that there is some delay. It could have been raised earlier. The point of order should be raised at the earliest, not at the end of the day.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I expected you to call one of us to move the motion, but you were engaged in some other business.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am never engaged by myself; the whole House and I together are engaged. I will deal with this question. Let me refer to these rules. The first rule is rule 31 dealing with List of business Rule 31 (3) says:

> "Save as otherwise provided in the rules, no business not included in the list of business for the day shall be transacted at any meeting without the leave of the Speaker."

I go now to rule 153. I will not take the time of the House by reading sub-rule (1). Sub-rule (2) reads:

> "If the Speaker is of opinion that the motion is in order....."

(MR. SPEAKER)

I suppose that this a condition precedent. When was it given ? I was told that it was given to the Secretary round about 3 30 P. M. Does the Hon'Member think that the moment the notice of the motion is given, all other work should not be taken up and that he should concentrate on this and say that because it was given yesterday, it should as a matter of course come to-day, not even to-morrow, not at any other time.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ —ನ್ಯಾಯ .....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not called upon Sri Gopala Gowda. There must be some method. If he wants to say anything, I have given him every chance.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.—We are trying to bring in the method.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Who is trying ?

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.—All of us.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Gopala Gowda should not do that unless I call his name. He has a right to bring in the method only in accordance with the rules, not in contravention of the rules. I was mentioning that the Speaker should be of opinion that the motion is in order. That means I must apply my mind. Sri Patil was pleased to observe, as I have already said that no doubt it is necessary that the mind should be applied, which necessarily means, I suppose that I must have some little time. What is the time that I should have compulsorily bestowed upon it ?

An HON'BLE MEMBER.—One hour.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is it that is going to happen if it is taken up to-morrow ? I cannot possibly understand. I must look to relative importance. After I apply my mind and that condition has been fulfilled I say, I am of opinion that the motion is in order, if I delay, the Hon'ble Member can very well say.....

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—What happened on the previous occasion ? The motion was delivered in your office by about 3-30 P.M. or 4 P.M. the next day you were pleased to put the matter for consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please read the previous motion.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The same motion expressing no confidence in the Council of Ministers.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Enumerating reasons 1, 2, 3 and so on.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—About this motion, I do not know what is the form. Only a few words were just mentioned in the Lok Sabha by Acharya Kriplani that 'we have no confidence in the Council of Ministers'. It is not a very big document for you to go through and apply your mind; it is not a complicated matter. After all, it is a very simple matter.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Leader of the Opposition spoke to me over the phone and I have told him that I am looking into it. In spite of that, he told me that it would be raised on the floor of the House.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—This question of no confidence should have precedence over everything else. When once the motion of no confidence is given to the Speaker or to the Secretary, no other business shall be conducted and that motion should get precedence; on no account it should be postponed. That is my personal feeling. How can it be postponed? When there is a motion to the effect that we have no confidence in the Council of Ministers, what business can be conducted, unless that is given precedence? That is why at the beginning itself I said that the motion should be admitted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will give Sri Gopala Gowda a chance, but he should not open his mouth till I call upon him to speak; that should be the agreement between him and me. (laughter).

Now, I will finish my ruling. I was mentioning that it was an initial ingredient that I should apply my mind and take a decision whatever it may be. I have to decide it, if the Hon'ble Members say that I have no right to think and 30 minutes elapsed and 6 hours elapsed and I am only to bring it before this House, I cannot understand.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—But, there are precedents. Please show me where time is taken?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am very sorry for the Leader of Opposition putting it that way. He may collect and I am also collecting that information whether reasonable time is not given to the Speaker. This is something which I cannot comprehend.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—We will give the chair reasonable time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is the reasonable time? Is it what he considers reasonable or what I consider it to be reasonable?

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ರೂರ್ 50ರ ಕೆಳಗೆ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ನೂಚನೆ ಬಂದರೆ 2 ಗಂಟೆ ನಾಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಒಂದು ನಿಲುವಳಿ ನೂಚನೆಗಿಂತಲೂ ಇದು ಪವಿತ್ರವಾದ್ದುದ್ದು ಎಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ಇದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಎದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ರೂಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾಲಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಡಿಸ್ಪ್ಯೂಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ 20 ಗಂಟೆ ಕಳೆದು ಹೋಗಿದೆ.

Even for the adjourment motion it says:

"51. Notice of an adjournment motion shall be given to the Secretary two hours before the commencement of the sitting on the day on which motion is proposed to be made. ಆದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಅವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯ, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಏನೂ ಕೊಂದರೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ತಾವು ಈ ವಿಧಿಬಂಧನದ ಮೇರೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಮುಂಚೆ ಬಂದ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತನ್ನ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ:

"153 (b) the member asking for leave shall, before the commencement of the sitting of that day, give to the Secretary a written notice of the motion which he proposes to move."

ಬರಹದಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಯಾವಾಗ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು? ಆ ದಿವಸದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪ ಶುರು ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲೇ, ಅಲ್ಲ ಚೈಂಬರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ).

"commencement of the sitting of that day"

ತಾವು ನೋಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಏನು! "If the Speaker is of the opinion that motion is in order, he shall read the motion to the Assembly and request those members who are in favour of leave being granted....."

ಅಷ್ಟೇ ನೋಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಕಷ್ಟ ಏನೋ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಲ್ಲ. I would very much appreciate your difficulty because the Leader of the House may not be present in the House and you may require time to consult him and all that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Do not imagine.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.—But, here is a special provision that unless the Speaker disposes of this point, no other business can be transacted. This is my submission.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಎಂ. ದೇವ್.—ತಮಗೆ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಕಾಲ ಬೇಡವೇ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ತಾವು ಕೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಿದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಾಲವಕಾಶ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಇದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Would Sri Patil like to have the ruling now only or as Sri Deo suggested, shall I think over it and give a considered ruling later?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, our difficulty is.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am asking a simple question. If the member wants a ruling now alone, I will give it. If he wants me to consider and give a considered ruling, I will consider it.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—My difficulty is, if you are prepared about the ruling, it should be given immediatly. If you feel that the matter requires some time or some authorities,etc., both regarding our resolution as well as the ruling, then our further requset is that the rest of the business of this House should be adjourned.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I cannot adjourn the House; during the hours of the work, I cannot possibly adjourn. Every thing should be done by the leave of the House. If Sri Patil wants he may move the House; I have no objection. My difficulty is, several members are saying so many things with which he does not agree.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—That is why I say, we must have a clear ruling which must be a precedent for the future because whatever that comes from the Chair is a law here and we have to abide by it. If you feel that some time is required for that, you may specify the time and the House should be adjourned. I hope that the House will agree in solving this difficulty. The House should give you full time to consider this matter.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—With your permission I would like to draw your attention to the Parliamentary Procedure in India.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it by Daniel?

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Yes, Sir. He says that in the House of Commons it is the practice that the Government in power should give an immediate opportunity for any motion that rises a definite question of want of confidence in the Government provided that the Motion is proposed or sanctioned by the recognised Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member opened the book, I said it was the book written by before so and so; so, let him not think that I have not seen it. Then, does we follow the procedure that the Leader of Opposition sanctioned the no-confidence motion? So far as my ruling, considered ruling after detailed study is concerned, it will not be delayed beyond tomorrow. So far as that adjournment of the House is concerned, I cannot agree unless the Hon'ble Member gets the consent of the House for adjournment.

2-30 P.M.

MYSORE VETERINARY PRACTITIONERS BILL, 1962.

Motion to Consider.

(Debate continued)

Sri B. D. JATTI.—In clause 24 it is said that veterinary practitioners cannot sign.....

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I may be allowed to make a request that the work of the House may be adjourned till tomorrow. That may be put before the House.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—How can we adjourn when we have sufficient work on hand ?.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—If my friend wants to rush with the work, he has ample opportunities. If he so wishes, we will walk out and let him finish his work, if that is the way my friend wants it.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Let the request of Mr. Patil be put before the House and if the House agrees the business of the House may be adjourned ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—There must be a limit to these requests. Anyway I will put it to the House. If everybody goes on at this rate, I would not be a Speaker, but a Messenger. A suggestion has been made and a request has come from Sri V. S. Patil and the Leader of the Opposition has desired that it may be put to the House that the House be adjourned for the rest of the day. Does the House agree to adjourn further business till I have given my ruling?

HON'BLE MEMBER.—"Nay".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Business will continue.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—I press for a division.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—For the adamant attitude of the Government and also the attitude of the ruling party in refusing to adjourn the House on this matter of importance, we on this side, protest strongly and walk out.

(Members of the Opposition then withdrawn from the House)